

REMARKS UNDER 37 CFR § 1.116

Formal Matters

Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-27 are pending after entry of the amendments set forth herein.

Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-25 were examined. Claims 8-11 and 21-23 were rejected. Claims 1-6, 14-20, 24 and 25 were allowed. Claims 12 and 13 were objected to.

Please replace claims 8 and 11 with the clean version provided above, and enter new claims 26 and 27 as provided above.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached is captioned "**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE.**"

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and remarks made herein.

No new matter has been added.

The Office Action

Initially, Applicants wish to extend their appreciation to the Examiner for the indicated allowance of claims 1-6, 14-20, 24 and 25, as well as the indicated allowable subject matter in claims 12 and 13.

Claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Hancock (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,157 B2). The Examiner indicated that the recitations "wherein said first end is adapted for attaching to a separated, complete drive mechanism" did not patentably distinguish the claims from the structure disclosed by Hancock because the "wherein" clause was not considered to further distinguish the structure recited.

In response thereto, Applicants have amended each of claims 8 and 11 to delete the discussed "wherein" clause. In its place, in each instance, the claims have been amended to further define recited first end as "adapted to attach to a separate, complete driving mechanism". It is respectfully submitted that this language structurally distinguishes the present invention as recited by claims 8 and 11 (and claims depending therefrom) over Hancock, since Hancock's blades are always attached to the driver. Further, it is respectfully submitted that it has been held that In a claim that was directed to a kit of component parts capable of being assembled, the Court held that limitations such as "members adapted

to be positioned" and "portions . . . being resiliently dilatable whereby said housing may be slidably positioned" serve to precisely define present structural attributes of interrelated component parts of the claimed assembly. *In re Venezia*, 530 F.2d 956, 189 USPQ 149 (CCPA 1976). (see MPEP Section 2173.05(g)).

In view of the above amendment of claims 8 and 11, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Hancock (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,157 B2), as being no longer appropriate. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments do not raise a new issue, since they address the same previously addressed issue of structurally limiting the presently claimed invention to blades that may be attached to a separate, complete drive mechanism.

Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hancock in view of Brief (U.S. Patent No. 4,747,395). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the recited combination of references for at least the same reasons that claims 8 and 11 patentably define over Hancock, as discussed above, since Brief does nothing to overcome the deficiencies of Hancock in meeting the recitations of claims 8 and 11, and since each of claims 21-23 depends from one of claims 8 and 11.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hancock in view of Brief (U.S. Patent No. 4,747,395), as being no longer appropriate.

With regard to newly submitted claims 26 and 27, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are clearly allowable in view of the Examiner's indication, in the Office Action dated June 19, 2002, that claims 12 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New claims 26 and 27 correspond to claims 12 and 13 in such form.

PTO Forms 1449

Upon review of the file for this application, Applicants have discovered that not all of the documents that were submitted in the parent application (Application Serial No. 09/305,811, now U.S. Patent No. 6,283,912) have been submitted in the instant application. Accordingly, Applicants are submitting herewith PTO Forms 1449 listing the remainder of the documents which have not been submitted, but which were considered and cited during the prosecution of the parent application. Copies of the documents are not included, as having been already previously submitted in the parent

application. Applicants would appreciate the Examiner initialing and returning an initialed copy of the enclosed PTO Forms 1449 to indicate consideration of the same.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2653, order number GUID-012CON.

Respectfully submitted,
LAW OFFICE OF ALAN W. CANNON

Date:

May 14, 2003

By:



Alan W. Cannon
Registration No. 34,977

LAW OFFICE OF ALAN W. CANNON
834 South Wolfe Road
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
Telephone: (408) 736-3554
Facsimile: (408) 736-3564

D:\DOCUMENTS\1.116 MENDMENT\GUID-012CON.doc

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS

Claim 8 was amended above as follows:

8. (Twice Amended) A surgical retractor blade, said retractor blade comprising a polymeric body having a first end adapted to attach to a separate, complete driving mechanism, a second end, a channel adapted to engage one side of an incision in a patient, and a rail extending along at least a portion of said polymeric body[, wherein said first end is adapted for attaching to a separate, complete drive mechanism].

Claim 11 was amended above as follows:

11. (Three Times Amended) A surgical retractor blade, said retractor blade comprising a body having a first end adapted to attach to a separate, complete driving mechanism, a second end, a channel adapted to engage one side of an incision in a patient, a rail extending along at least a portion of said body, and a plurality of open slots for receiving a suture therein, wherein said open slots have an internal wall and a suture locking member having a fixed end and a free end, said free end engaging said internal wall so as to clamp a suture placed between said free [ended] end and said internal wall[, wherein said first end is adapted for attaching to a separate, complete drive mechanism].

RECEIVED
MAY 27 2003
GROUP 3600

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700